

As a former ombudsman in New York, who worked with senior citizens on a regular basis, I understand the financial pressures that senior citizens are under. Usually, they're on a fixed income. The majority of them are under a doctor's care. And some of them even permanently reside in a convalescent care center.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that unless we act now those same individuals will be needlessly exposed to a world without adequate health care—and this group numbers close to 37 million.

Healthy, strong seniors, living independently, must be our goal. We must save Medicare. The alternative is simply unacceptable.

This isn't about politics—This is simply about the lives of 37 million people who are depending on us.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say I've signed my name on the dotted line, and I will keep my promise.

DEMOCRATS ARE SILENT ON HOW TO SAVE MEDICARE

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, in what should be one of most important issues on their agenda, the Democrats have come up unbelievably silent on the issue of what to do to save Medicare.

The trustees have said Medicare goes bankrupt in 7 years. Yet the Democrats are doing nothing about it. They are intellectually bankrupt on this issue. In fact the Baltimore Sun has said how the intellectual initiative has switched from the Democrats to the Republicans is visible in the fears debate over Medicare. Bill Clinton's Democrats find themselves defending the status quo.

Unfortunately, they also find themselves playing politics Richard Nixon style. Nixon once said that people vote their fears. That is what the Democrats are counting on.

The Republican Party this year is counting on the people going out and voting their hopes and dreams and rewarding those who dare to step into the arena and fight and get themselves bloodied to save Medicare for the next century.

DEMOCRATS PLAYING GAMES WITH MEDICARE

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, day after day, the Democrats continue to play games. They are denying the underlining factor that our senior citizens need a helping hand. While seniors fear the bankruptcy of Medicare. The Democrats are threatening to ruin the pensions of hardworking Americans.

We will not use these political games and scare tactics. Instead, we will protect, preserve and improve Medicare for the American people. Our goal is to

ensure Medicare for another 30 years and beyond.

We will streamline and weed out the waste and abuse of this bloated system. In doing so, spending for Medicare will increase. Let me rephrase that—Medicare will not be cut! It will continue to be the fastest growing program. Spending per senior will increase from \$4,800 today to more than \$6,700 in 2002.

Let us solve the matters at hand instead of making excuses. We must work for the people who made this country great.

□ 0920

IT IS WRONG TO CUT MEDICARE TO GIVE TAX BREAKS TO AMERICA'S RICHEST CITIZENS

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday all of us across the country celebrate the 30th anniversary of the signing of Medicare. Thirty years ago, leading up to President Johnson's signing Medicare in Independence, Missouri, 93 percent of Republican Members of Congress, including then Congressman BOB DOLE, a Republican from Kansas, opposed the creation of Medicare. In the 1970's and the 1980's, the far right wing of the Republican Party continued to try to dismantle and cut Medicare.

Today, in 1995, literally 99 percent of the Republican Members of this body have voted to make almost \$30 billion in cuts in Medicare. The fact is, prior to Medicare's creation in the mid 1960s, more than half of older Americans did not have health care coverage. Today, 99 percent of America's elderly may have health care coverage. The fact is, Medicare works. It is simply wrong, Mr. Speaker, to cut \$300 billion from Medicare in order to give tax breaks to the richest American citizens. It is simply not right.

WORDS FROM REPUBLICANS CANNOT HIDE THEIR INTENTIONS REGARDING MEDICARE

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we hear some quite cynical remarks about Medicare this morning. Our friends on the Republican side of the aisle say they want to save Medicare, but their actions demonstrate they want to shred it. They say they want to save Medicare, but they took \$90 billion out of it in their recent budget resolution. They say that they want to save Medicare, but when the Congress first passed it, they first tried to stop it, and only after they could not stop it did some of them vote for it. Their own majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], has

indicated, very frankly, that if this world were shaped to his image, there would be no room in an entrepreneurial society for Medicare.

Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, but their words cannot hide their intentions. America's senior citizens know that.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on National Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the democratic leadership has been notified of this, and we have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2099, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELLER). Pursuant to House Resolution 201 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2099.

□ 0923

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099), making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and

Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 27, 1995, title III was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the Committee of that day, the following amendments, and any amendments thereto, are debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment: amendment No. 48 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for 20 minutes; amendment No. 26 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], for 20 minutes; amendment No. 57 offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], for 50 minutes; amendment No. 66 offered by either the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], or the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], for 90 minutes; amendment Nos. 55 or 56 offered by either the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] or the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], for 20 minutes; and amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], for 40 minutes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER:

Amendment No. 57: Page 70, lines 13 through 19, strike "\$5,449,600,000" and all that follows through "obligation until September 30, 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,849,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 27, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 25 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is simple. It is an amendment that would cancel the space station from the NASA program, and it differs from the amendment that we dealt with yesterday, labeled the Obey amendment, in that our amendment has all of the savings go for deficit reduction. We do not intend to respend any of the remaining monies into other social programs or other sundry programs within the Government departments. This amendment is intended for deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I testified the other day before the Committee on Rules of

the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and not only asked the gentleman from New York for this opportunity to give this amendment the approval of this body, but also to testify strongly in favor of the lockbox amendment, so that we could finally get savings from these kinds of amendments go directly to the deficit, and not have these games being played that we are not saving money if we cut a program. Certainly if we cut this program, these monies will not be in future budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little bit about what this amendment is not about. This amendment is not about taking away Christopher Columbus' ship. We are going to hear all these grandiose promises about what the space station is capable of doing. We are not trying to wipe out past discoveries. We are not trying to take away Charles Lindburgh's plane.

We are not trying to say to Jim Lovell that he did not show a great deal of courage in this very, very good movie, "Apollo 13." We are not trying to take an Oscar nomination away from Tom Hanks. We are saying, "Judge this program on the merits, not on a movie." I saw "Apollo 13." It is a great movie. I recommend it to everybody in the body and people watching throughout the country. However, we do not base Federal allocations of resources on money and on movies. If we felt that, I think Hoosiers was a great basketball movie about the State of Indiana, but I am not up here advocating that we spend Federal dollars on Indiana IU basketball programs. I hope that is not the justification we hear over there on Apollo 13.

Sure, it is a great movie, but look at the merits of this program. What has the space station done? When Ronald Reagan first devised this program in 1984, President Reagan said this:

This program will cost us \$8 billion. It can achieve eight scientific missions here and it will be done in 10 years.

Today, in 1995, this program has gone from \$8 billion to \$94 billion. I thought these new Republicans coming in the new election were coming here to judge these programs on the merits, not on the movies. Here is the most recent General Accounting Office report: \$94 billion, from an \$8 billion start. We are going to make tough decisions in this Congress to move to a balanced budget, and certainly a program that has had that kind of cost increase does not deserve to have taxpayer dollars just thrown at it year after year.

We might say, "OK, it has gone from \$8 to \$94 billion. The science is magnificent. It is truly inspiring for our country." The science has gone from eight scientific missions in 1984, where they had a platform to study the Earth with environmental problems, a platform to look out into the solar system, a stepping stone to help us repair Hubble; it cannot do any of those things anymore, Mr. Chairman. All this \$94 billion space station can do now is help us study the

effects of gravity on men and women in space.

If that is all this thing can do, let us continue to dock with the Russians at Mir and not buy a \$94 billion space station. Let us continue our international efforts with the Russians and modify an existing space station, and utilize that for these efforts.

We are also off schedule, overbudget, little science, supposed to be done in 1994, and now we will be lucky if this program is completed by the year 2004. Members are going to hear a lot of claims from proponents of the space station that this is an international partnership, and we have to have these international partnerships in the future, based upon science. I wish I had the kind of international partnership for my investments that the Russians have on this international partnership. They are not putting up money; we are putting up money for the Russians. We are sending \$400 million of NASA money, taxpayer money from the United States to Russia, to get their international agreement and scientific cooperation. That is not an international partnership, that is us putting all the risk and liability out there, and the Russians getting all the benefits. Also, the Europeans and the Japanese and the Canadians are thinking of pulling out of this international space station.

Members are also going to hear a lot about how great this program is to solve breast cancer, that we are going to have all these panaceas up in space. Mr. Chairman, in the NIH budget today, what we are funding to the NIH, we cannot even fund most of the approved grants on breast cancer here on Earth with the funding problems we have at the NIH. We are going to spend \$94 billion up in the sky, and maybe have a 1 in a million or a 1 in 10 million chance to do this up there? Let us spend that money on Earth, at the NIH, to solve these problems.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are also going to hear a claim from the other side that we have gone so far and we might as well continue this program; we have spent \$12 billion. That is not a good argument either, Mr. Chairman. How can we justify the expenditure of another \$80 billion? We are not a third of the way, we are not halfway. Measure these programs on their merits. All science is not successful.

Surely Christopher Columbus was successful, and we are proud of that effort. Surely Charles Lindburgh was successful, and we are very proud of that effort. Surely we have had great successes with Neal Armstrong. Every scientific endeavor is not destined to be as successful as those, and this, on the merits, does not deserve continued Federal funding.

Before I yield some of my time to the distinguished cosponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], let me just quote from a famous scientist. Albert Einstein said this:

It is not enough that you should understand about applied science in order that your work may increase man's blessings. Concern for the man himself and his fate must always form the chief interest of all technical endeavors. Never forget this in the midst of your diagrams and equations.

Diagrams and equations, technical endeavors, they are surely what we need to base so much of our hopes and dreams on in the future, but ask Thomas Edison how many successes he had. He did not succeed with every single invention. He was wise enough to know which ones to pursue and which ones to table.

Let us as a Congress make some decisions around this body to cut some of the programs that have had Federal funding for years and years and do not deserve continued funding. Let us make some tough decisions around here to cut spending, whether it be a B-2 bomber, whether it be a space station, whether it be a tobacco subsidy. Let us move toward a balanced budget, in the best interests and the best endeavors, as Albert Einstein said, of men and women.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the State of New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the cosponsor of the amendment and somebody I have a great deal of respect for.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

One of the arguments we have heard yesterday and we will hear today is that without the space station, there will be no space program. The proponents of the space station sincerely believe that proposition, but I think they have it exactly wrong. The space station is killing our space program.

In years past, when the budget for NASA was rising at a healthy clip, the space station's voracious appetite made it impossible for us to conduct some very important and worthwhile programs of NASA. The Advanced X-ray Astrophysics Facility was scaled down and delayed, the Comet Rendezvous/Asteroid Flyby was canceled, the Space Infrared Telescope Facility was scaled down and it was delayed, the Compton Observatory was scaled down and delayed, the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy was scaled down, the Cassini Saturn mission was scaled down, the Earth Observation System was scaled down. These are some of the NASA programs that have already been victims of a static budget, or a slowly increasing budget.

We now have a declining budget for NASA, and a voracious appetite for a space station which is going to consume more valuable programs in space and on Earth.

I am not alone in believing that the space station means death for a good space program. There is nobody in this House who believes more deeply in space exploration than the former chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN]. Until this year, he was one of

the most forceful, effective, and knowledgeable proponents of the Space Station as part of a comprehensive program for us to explore space and learn more from space. However, yesterday he came to the painful decision that we cannot afford the space station and still have a decent space program. He concluded, as a number of us have concluded in years past, that in a period of static and now declining NASA budgets, the space station will surely cannibalize the truly valuable aspects of the space program.

Before I yield back my time, and I would hope to have an opportunity to speak again, I do want to point out to my Republican colleagues, particularly, that there is a major difference between this amendment and the Obey amendment. Whereas the Obey amendment distributed most of the savings from cutting the space station to social programs, this amendment applies every penny of net savings to deficit reduction.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as you listen to today's space station debate you will hear the voices of fear. That's right—fear. Fear of the unknown. Throughout history there have been those who feared the future so intently that they refused to invest in it. They justified their fear by pursuing objectives closely tied to present needs with the claim that only by spending on the known can we prepare for the unknown.

Invariably those who refused to focus on the future have been wrong. History has been unkind to those peoples and nations who pursued policies tied to fear.

Today we debate the future. We debate the promise of the future against the fear of the future.

I am hopeful this Congress will come down on the side of the promise. The space station is all about vision, hope, and promise.

What we are creating in the space station is a unique laboratory environment in which scientific work, unthinkable on Earth, can be done.

The station is a unique laboratory. You cannot replicate on Earth a microgravity environment where long duration study can be done.

The work in that laboratory is scientific, meaning that we are pursuing the new knowledge needed for our economic future.

The work cannot be totally quantified at this point because some of it, perhaps most of it, is unthinkable until the new environment and the new experience has been created.

What we are doing when we build a space station is crating for ourselves and our posterity the ability to touch tomorrow.

Is there anyone among us who does not believe that at some time now or in

the future men and women will go beyond the bounds of Earth and explore the plants and the universe? How can you not believe that? After all, we already have left our footprints on the Moon and sent our technology to the cosmos.

And what have we learned? We have learned exploration is very difficult with the chance of unplanned consequences. But we have also learned that exploration of the most hostile frontier humankind has ever encountered has made us more creative.

President Kennedy told us that we would go to the Moon and do the other things, not because they were easy, but because they were hard.

That's the point. If this was easy or inexpensive there would be no challenge. The hardships and the sacrifices necessary to have humans live in, work in, and explore space, make us better, stronger, and richer. We learn new things. We create new technology. We build new relationships. We prove to the world why we are capable of leading the world technologically and economically.

When the question is asked, can we afford this project, that's the wrong question. The real question should be, how can we afford not to build a space station? How can we deny the destiny of humankind? How can we not do what we are now capable of doing to push further toward gathering the new knowledge that can only be found on a distant frontier?

The only real reason for not doing what we can do and should do is fear. Space station is something we can do. The technology is feasible. The research is valuable. The potentials are enormous. And the cost is assumed within our balanced budget goal. We can do this. We should not fear it.

The space station is something we should do. As a nation that has been built by explorers and investors, we should continue to build, explore and invent. As a nation committed to pushing frontiers, we should not back away from the space frontier. As a nation that seeks to lead the world in the next century, we should demonstrate the leadership our technology, and our courage can provide us.

Only fear can stop us. Fear too often blurs vision. Fear too often results in hopelessness. Fear too often negates promise. Fear too often undermines judgment. Debilitating fear of a great unknown that we are capable of exploring and exploiting would be a modern tragedy.

Make no mistake, a vote to cancel the space station has consequences well beyond that singular decision. A cancellation of space station is a decision that ultimately will stop America's human spaceflight program. A cancellation of space station will forfeit America's established leadership in space endeavors—leadership that has paid back to our economy at a rate of more than \$2 for every dollar invested.

Don't capitulate to fear of the unknown. Join us in one of humankind's

greatest endeavors. Join us in providing future generations their chance to reach beyond themselves. Join us in approving the international space station that will extend our reach into the future.

An old hymn talks about the future's broadening way. We can broaden it a little bit today by taking another step into the universe.

□ 0940

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE], a distinguished freshman Republican member.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

The space program has done some wonderful things. I stood in awe when man first walked on the Moon. I stand in awe of the space shuttle every time it launches. Mr. Chairman, I also stand in awe of our nearly \$5 trillion national debt.

The space station may be a grand idea, but we must face the reality of its \$94 billion price tag.

We must face the reality that the entire project is based on overly ambitious goals. Costs for the space station have been rising while the target date for its completion has been slipping.

Many questions remain. To what extent will the Russians, and other international partners, participate in this project? Will the shuttle program be able to handle the increased flight schedule? Is the target cost of the space station going to skyrocket if Boeing cannot reach acceptable agreements with the subcontractors?

But the central question we must face has nothing to do with international agreements and theoretical science. The question is, How can we stand in this Chamber and heap additional debt on our children and grandchildren.

A vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment is not a vote against space exploration. It is a vote about economic realities.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the American people that President John F. Kennedy helped us dream by leading us into space exploration. How much excitement and inspiration and anticipation this country faced as we began that great historical effort, but in this era of budget cutting, some have argued that NASA has to take its share of budget cuts and the space station will have to be sacrificed as a result.

While I have great admiration for the gentleman from Indiana, I also admire the fiscal fairness that has to be done. It is imperative that we consider the efforts that NASA has already made, the cuts that it has already made and the efficiencies that it has already implemented.

The agency has been standing up and stepping ahead in the realm of cost reduction and efficiency improvements. As part of this zero-based review, NASA reduced its budget by \$5 billion over the next 5 years. Over the past 3 years the agency has reduced its multiyear budget plan by 35 percent, a savings to the American taxpayer of \$40 billion. To this point, the space station is on budget and on schedule.

You might say that is just something you have said; but, no, I have asked the project director directly: "Sir, are you on schedule? Are you on budget? Will you be monitoring your contractors? Will you be ensuring the American people that you will keep this project on budget and on schedule?"

"Yes, we will."

NASA has clearly demonstrated its commitment, to fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction. Do I see opportunities for inner city communities in the 18th Congressional District in Houston? Yes, I do. Education opportunities for children in my neighborhood schools. Frankly, I will say to the Members, jobs for minorities and women in America and business opportunities for minorities and women in America, that is the new spirit and the opportunity for NASA as it grows with space station.

Let us not forget the benefits we will all reap collectively: Research that can benefit all of us, from biotechnology, to environmental health, to cardiology, technological research in the areas of semiconductors and metal alloys, among others. We cannot ignore our international partners who have already contributed over \$9 billion in investment. We cannot ignore the potential for medical and technological breakthroughs that can result from this project.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, we cannot ignore the dreams and aspirations and hopes of all Americans that we too can explore. We can make the difference. Support the international space station, and do not support the Roemer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive messages from the President.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEN-SENRENNER) assumed the chair.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 0950

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1996

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to bring the space station to a halt. We need to be realistic about this project.

Let us look at the commitment that we are asking the American people to make. Through the year 2012, the space station will cost \$94 billion. Yes, \$94 billion with a "b." The operational life of the station is only 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, in my district, the southern portion of the State of New Jersey, I go to the church halls and the fire halls, and I look at my constituents and I hear them say that they were working harder than they have ever worked before and they do not feel they are getting ahead. I listen to them say how many of them are working two and three jobs and their spouse is working two and three jobs, and they want the U.S. Government, they want this Congress, to recognize the efforts that they are making and the sacrifices that they are making.

This is a priority that we cannot afford at this time. We are being asked to make many difficult choices. We are running through that process. We are committed to balancing the budget by the year 2002. But these are Federal dollars that we cannot afford. Maybe sometime in the future. Maybe after the budget is balanced. But to those hardworking citizens who are doing their best, who are doing their part to make this democracy work, I do not think we can look them in the eye and tell them that we are willing to spend \$94 billion on a program like this when we are asking them to make the sacrifices that we are.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment and for the space station.

Mr. ROEMER is a very fine and valued Member of this House and of the Science Committee where we serve together. But in this amendment I believe he is incorrect.

This amendment was also offered in the Science Committee authorization process, where it was defeated. During our discussion various members suggested specific benefits that may flow from the space station, including advances in the cure for cancer and the understanding of tumor growth.

These benefits may very well flow from the space station, but in speaking for the space station in committee I advanced this view: The